



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Re application of:) Attorney Docket No. 579510-630-001
Wakabayashi et al.)
)
Application No.: 10/633,162)
)
Filed: July 30, 2003)
)
For: SYRINGE PUMP)
)
Examiner: Han, Mark K.)
)
Art Unit: 3763)
)
Confirmation No.: 7506)

REMARKS

Claim 4 has been cancelled so that only claims 1-3 are now in the application.

Claim 1 is rejected under section 102 as being anticipated by the U.S. 6,592,551 to Cobb. This rejection is respectfully traversed as it applies to amended claim 1. In the Cobb reference, the rotational axis 48 of the movable section 41 does not oppose the flange supporting section 37 and therefore the arm 44 is required between the movable section 41 and the rotational axis 48.

This results in a complex mechanism for the syringe pump and the syringe pump is of a large size. Accordingly, the invention now claimed is clearly different from that shown in Cobb both as to structure and function.

Because Cobb does not include every limitation of claim 1, Cobb cannot anticipate claim 1.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under section 103 as being unpatentable over Cobb in view of U.S. 5,545,140 to Conero et al. ("Conero"). This rejection is also respectfully traversed. The combination of Cobb and Conero does not include the claim limitation that "the flange attaching operation section serves also as the barrel pressing section." In order to properly make obvious

an invention, the combination of references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

That is not the case with regard to claim 2.


With regard to claim 3, it is indicated in the office action that Conero discloses the barrel supporting section 32 and the barrel clamping section 45 and therefore the combined device of Cobb and Conero would be capable of being programmed to perform the intended use of the "differential section" in claim 3. It is respectfully contended that neither Cobb nor Conero teach or suggest the differential section.

In addition, the barrel clamping section 35 in Conero is operated manually and therefore cannot be programmed. Accordingly, not all of the limitations in claim 3 are found in the combination of Cobb and Conero.

In view of the above comments, the examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections and pass the application to issue.

Dated: December 13, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph H. Golant
Reg. No. 24,210
JONES DAY
77 West Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60601-1692
(312) 269-1534
jhgolant@jonesday.com